

## REMARKS

The restriction requirement has been made final "because applicant's amendment pursues divergent subject matter which is patentably distinct as outlined in the Restriction requirement mailed on December 30, 2005." Applicants respectfully disagree since the restriction requirement was justified on grounds that the claimed process could be practiced without a plunger, and no other justification was asserted and/or outlined in the restriction requirement. Applicants responded by requiring that the process be practiced with a plunger, rendering the justification set forth in the earlier restriction requirement moot. Applicants are now left to speculate as to what supposed ground, which is not of record, justifies the restriction requirement. In order to perfect a review of that finding, Applicants respectfully request that the grounds now justifying the restriction requirement be made of record, or the restriction requirement be withdrawn, and all of the claims be examined as they have been on at least four prior occasions.

Claims 10, 13, 15, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Wich in view of Jones, Jr. et al. The rejection is justified on grounds that "Wich fails to disclose[s] a high pressure seal", but "Jones discloses a high pressure seal 16 in passage 15". Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections since both of these assertions are not supported by the references. In particular, Wich teaches at column 6, lines 18-22, and elsewhere, that o-ring 124 seals fluid bore 52 with regard to fluid bore 51. Thus, Wich does clearly disclose a high pressure seal. Jones, on the other hand does not even teach a high pressure seal in its fuel injector mounting passage 15. There should be no dispute that the thing identified as passage 15 in Jones is actually a tapered hole for receiving a fuel injector mounted in the cylinder head. Furthermore, Jones teaches at column 3, lines 5-7 that the fuel injector seats in the tapered passage of hole 15. Since the sleeve 16 of Jones is not tapered, there should be no dispute that the fuel injector would seal the bore 15 by seating elsewhere, and there should be no dispute that the fuel injector seating in bore 15 provides any seal necessary to prevent hot gases from escaping through the cylinder head. Thus, the office action is mistaken since it is a fuel injector rather than the sleeve 16 that seals against the escape of high pressure gases in the Jones cylinder head. The office action then goes on to assert that the Jones item 16 would be added to the Wich fuel injector "for added strength". Applicants again respectfully disagree since Wich clearly teaches that the two parts of his fuel injector 10 and 11 are joined by screws 12 and 12a as shown in Figure 2. Thus, this raises the question as to what is meant by the office action by an assertion that the sleeve 16 adds strength to what in the Wich fuel injector? Thus, because Wich does teach a high pressure seal, Jones does not teach a high pressure seal, and no one with ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious

to add the alignment sleeve of Jones for added strength to anything identified in either of the cited references, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding rejections based upon Wich in view of Jones Jr. et al. be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Wich in view of Kenny. Now the office action acknowledges that "Wich discloses a seal 124", but that one with ordinary skill in the art would have for some reason found it obvious to replace Wich's o-ring seal 124 with Kenny's concrete tube sleeve to provide a fluid seal and maintain an inline passage. Applicants respectfully disagree since to include the alignment sleeve of Kenny into the Wich fuel injector would confound its express teachings of joining pieces 10 and 11 by screws 12 and 12a as shown in Figure 2 of Wich. In other words, Applicants respectfully assert that it is the alignment of the screw holes in Wich that are more important for there successful attachment rather than maintaining exact fluid alignment between the respective fluid bores. Thus, Applicants request clarification. Is the Examiner suggesting that Wich would also abandon his attachment scheme, or that Wich would find some way to maintain alignment of his attachment bores and the fluid bores via some methodology not taught in any of the references of record? In other words, why would one with ordinary skill in the art be motivated to confound the Wich et al. fuel injector by substituting an alignment sleeve for a concrete tubular mold in order to abandon his already taught fluid seal and to introduce a exact passage alignment issue that is not necessary for the proper functioning of the Wich device. Thus, Applicants again respectfully request that the outstanding rejections against claims 10 and 12 based upon Wich in view of Kenny be withdrawn.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Ueda in view of Jones, Jr. et al. The rejection is justified on grounds that Ueda supposedly fails to disclose a high pressure seal, but Jones does supposedly disclose a high pressure seal. While it may be true that Ueda did not explicitly show a separate component that could be identified as a high pressure seal, Ueda clearly shows two fuel injector components in contact with one another at a plane, and held together to prevent against leakage at the planar interface of the two parts, in a manner well known in the art. In this regard, Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner to the literally hundreds of fuel injector prior art references that show a stack of components with high pressure fluid passages through the components and sealing provided by holding those components together at planar interfaces using bolts and the like. Ueda is no different. Thus, Ueda does provide a means of avoiding leakage (a sealing strategy), and one with ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to add a seal to Ueda since it is only the office action that is suggesting that Ueda is in need of an additional component to seal its passageways. In addition, Jones flatly

fails to even disclose a seal as discussed above. Instead, Jones clearly shows a way of retrofitting a worn cylinder head and provides an alignment sleeve, but the passageway that receives the sleeve is sealed by attachment of a fuel injector in the cylinder head as clearly taught by Jones. Thus, Applicants again respectfully assert that the rejection in the office action is not well made, and respectfully requests that the same be withdrawn.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Ueda in view of Jones Jr. et al. and Campion et al. Applicants respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn since Ueda in view of Jones does not teach the basic invention of claim 10, and Campion et al. does nothing to remedy the problems associated with combining Ueda with Jones.

This application is believed to be in condition for allowance of claims 10, 12-19, 21-23 and 25-30. However, if the Examiner believes that some minor additional clarification would put this application in even better condition for allowance the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (812) 333-5355 in order to hasten the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MB McNeil', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael B. McNeil  
Reg. No. 35,949